

BALANCE IN STABLE CATEGORIES

PEDRO NICOLÁS AND MANUEL SAORÍN

ABSTRACT. We study when the stable category $\frac{\mathcal{A}}{\langle \mathcal{T} \rangle}$ of an abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ modulo a full additive subcategory $\mathcal{T}$ is balanced and, in case $\mathcal{T}$ is functorially finite in $\mathcal{A}$, we study a weak version of balance for $\frac{\mathcal{A}}{\langle \mathcal{T} \rangle}$. Precise necessary and sufficient conditions are given in case $\mathcal{T}$ is either a Serre class or a class consisting of projective objects. The results in this second case apply very neatly to (generalizations of) hereditary abelian categories.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Monomorphisms and strong monomorphisms in stable categories	3
3. When $\mathcal{T}$ is a Serre class	5
4. Balance when $\mathcal{T}$ consists of projective objects	7
5. Weak balance when $\mathcal{T}$ consists of projective objects	12
6. Some examples	18
References	20

1. INTRODUCTION

Given an additive category $\mathcal{C}$ and a full additive subcategory $\mathcal{T}$, the *stable category* $\underline{\mathcal{C}} := \mathcal{C} / \langle \mathcal{T} \rangle$ of $\mathcal{C}$ with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ has the same objects as $\mathcal{C}$, but $\underline{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y)$ is the abelian group obtained from $\mathcal{C}(X, Y)$ by making zero those morphisms which factor through an object of $\mathcal{T}$. These categories have played a fundamental role in Mathematics, specially when $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}$ is an abelian category and the subcategory $\mathcal{T}$ has good homological properties. One finds in the literature early important applications of stable categories to Commutative Algebra and Algebraic Geometry [2] or Representation Theory of Artin algebras [3], in this later case leading to a milestone in the area, namely, the proof of the existence of almost split sequences in the category of finitely generated modules over such algebras. In more recent times, a particular case has received much interest, namely, when $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}$ is an abelian Frobenius category and $\mathcal{T}$ is the subcategory of its projective (=injective) objects. That includes the case in which $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{CB}$ is the category of cochain complexes of an abelian category $\mathcal{B}$, thus leading to the homotopy category $\mathcal{HB}$ [10, Chapter 1], [13], and the case in which $\mathcal{A} = B\text{Mod}$ is the category of modules over a block of a finite-group algebra. In this way, stable categories are a fundamental tool in

The authors have been supported by the D.G.I. of the Spanish Ministry of Education and the Fundación ‘Séneca’ of Murcia, with a part of FEDER funds from the European Commission.

modern Modular Representation Theory to tackle long-standing open problems like the abelian defect group conjecture [18], [21].

In full generality, stable categories are neither abelian nor triangulated and, for a time, there was a need to find a suitable framework in which they could be inscribed. With sufficiently general hypotheses, that framework is provided by one-sided triangulated categories, in the terminology of [5], or, equivalently, by suspended categories, in the terminology of [12]. As shown by Beligianis and Marmaridis [5], if $\mathcal{T}$ is contravariantly (resp. covariantly) finite in the abelian category $\mathcal{A}$, then $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ has a structure of left (resp. right) triangulated category. In addition, if $\mathcal{T}$ is functorially finite, *i.e.* both contravariantly and covariantly finite, then the corresponding stable category satisfies all the axioms needed to be a pretriangulated category. This latter class of categories includes the abelian and triangulated ones and, also, the homotopy categories of additive closed model categories in the sense of Quillen [6, Chapter II].

One of the common features of abelian and triangulated categories is that they are *balanced*, *i.e.* every morphism which is both a monomorphism and an epimorphism is necessarily an isomorphism. That property is no longer shared by pretriangulated categories, although monomorphisms and epimorphisms in them are easily detected using triangles. Indeed, the following lemma and its dual have an easy proof.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a left triangulated category with loop functor $\Omega : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. For a morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathcal{X}$, the following assertions are equivalent:*

- 1) *f is a monomorphism.*
- 2) *There is a left triangle $\Omega Y \rightarrow Z \xrightarrow{0} X \xrightarrow{f} Y$.*

In view of the above lemma, it makes sense to give the following:

Definition 1. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a left triangulated category with loop functor $\Omega : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. A morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathcal{X}$ will be said to be a *strong monomorphism* if there is a left triangle $\Omega Y \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ in $\mathcal{X}$. The dual notion on a right triangulated category is that of *strong epimorphism*. Finally, if $\mathcal{X}$ is a pretriangulated category we shall say that it is *weakly balanced* in case that every morphism which is both a strong mono and strong epi is an isomorphism.

It is natural to expect that the class of balanced (resp. weakly balanced) pretriangulated categories is an interesting one. The moral goal of this paper is to show that (weak) balance is a very restrictive condition on stable categories. We show that by considering an arbitrary abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ and making two particular choices of the subcategory $\mathcal{T}$, namely, when $\mathcal{T}$ is a Serre class or when $\mathcal{T}$ consists of projective objects. The organization of the paper goes as follows. In Section 2 we characterize monomorphism and strong monomorphisms in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$, for any full additive subcategory $\mathcal{T}$ closed under direct summands. In Section 3 we show that if $\mathcal{T}$ is a covariantly finite Serre class in $\mathcal{A}$, then $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ is (weakly) balanced if and only if $\mathcal{T}$ is a direct summand of $\mathcal{A}$ as an additive category (Corollary 1). In the later sections of the paper $\mathcal{T}$ is supposed to consist of projective objects, in which case the balance of $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ is characterized in Section 4 (Theorem 1) and the weak balance in Section 5 (Theorem 2). A byproduct is that if $\mathcal{T}$ consists of projective-injective objects, then $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ is always balanced. When $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{H}$ has the property that subobjects of projective objects are projective (*e.g.* if $\mathcal{H}$ is a hereditary abelian category), these results give

that if $\mathcal{T}$ is covariantly finite then $\underline{\mathcal{H}}$ is (weakly) balanced if and only if ${}^\perp\mathcal{T}$ is closed under taking subobjects (Proposition 9). The final section of the paper gives some examples in categories of modules showing, in particular, that stable balanced categories need not be either abelian or triangulated and, also, that weakly balanced stable categories need not be balanced.

All throughout the paper $\mathcal{A}$ will be an abelian category, $\mathcal{T}$ will be a full additive subcategory closed under direct summands, $\langle \mathcal{T} \rangle$ will be the ideal of $\mathcal{A}$ formed by the morphisms that factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\underline{\mathcal{A}} := \mathcal{A}/\langle \mathcal{T} \rangle$ the associated quotient category. The hypothesis of $\mathcal{T}$ being closed under direct summands is not strictly necessary for the ideals $\langle \mathcal{T} \rangle$ and $\langle \text{add}(\mathcal{T}) \rangle$ coincide, where $\text{add}(\mathcal{T})$ denotes the closure under finite direct sums and direct summands. But it simplifies the statements and we will assume it in the sequel.

The reader is referred to [17] for the concepts of (pre)envelopes, (pre)covers and contravariantly (resp. covariantly) finite subcategories that we shall frequently use in the paper. By [5, Theorem 3.1], when $\mathcal{T}$ is contravariantly (resp. covariantly) finite in $\mathcal{A}$, the stable category $\underline{\mathcal{A}} := \mathcal{A}/\langle \mathcal{T} \rangle$ has a canonical structure of left (resp. right) triangulated category, where the loop (resp. suspension) functor $\Omega : \underline{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{A}}$ (resp. $\Sigma : \underline{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{A}}$) is defined on objects as the kernel (resp. cokernel) of a $\mathcal{T}$ -precover (resp. $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope). When $\mathcal{T}$ is functorially finite in $\mathcal{A}$, the category $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ becomes pretriangulated. The reader is referred to [12], [5] and [6] for the definitions and terminology concerning one-sided triangulated (or suspended) categories and pretriangulated categories.

The terminology on general categories used in this paper is standard and can be found in common textbooks on the subject, like [15]. For the sake of intuition and simplification of proofs, we shall allow ourselves some abuse of terminology concerning abelian categories and shall use expressions of module theory, like “canonical inclusion $\text{im}(f) \hookrightarrow Y$ ” for a morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$, meaning the (unique up to isomorphism) monomorphism appearing in the epi-mono factorization of f . We hope that our choice will not stop the reader from understanding statements and proofs. For the final section, the terminology concerning rings can be found in [1] and [20] while that concerning finite dimensional algebras can be found in [19] and [4].

Acknowledgements: The authors thank Kent Fuller for telling them about the main result of reference 8 and to Bernhard Keller for calling their attention on the result of Verdier mentioned in the final remark of Section 5.

2. MONOMORPHISMS AND STRONG MONOMORPHISMS IN STABLE CATEGORIES

In this section we undertake the identification of monomorphisms and strong monomorphisms in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$. All throughout the paper, the image of a morphism f under the canonical projection $\mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \underline{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}/\langle \mathcal{T} \rangle$ will be denoted by $\overline{f}$.

Proposition 1. *For a morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathcal{A}$ the following assertions are equivalent:*

- 1) $\overline{f}$ is a monomorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$.
- 2) For every $p \in \mathcal{A}(T, Y)$ with $T \in \mathcal{T}$, the parallel to p in the pullback of f and p factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$.

When, in addition, $\mathcal{T}$ is contravariantly finite in $\mathcal{A}$ the following assertions are also equivalent:

- 3) For some $\mathcal{T}$ -precover $p_Y : T_Y \rightarrow Y$ the parallel to p_Y in the pullback of f and p_Y factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$.
- 4) In the left triangulated category $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ there is a left triangle of the form

$$\Omega Y \rightarrow Z \xrightarrow{\bar{0}} X \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} Y$$

Proof. 1) $\Rightarrow$ 2) From the cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z & \xrightarrow{g} & X \\ \downarrow h & & \downarrow f \\ T & \xrightarrow{p} & Y \end{array}$$

we have $\bar{f}\bar{g} = \bar{0}$ and so $\bar{g} = \bar{0}$, i.e. g factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$.

2) $\Rightarrow$ 1) Assume $\bar{f}\bar{u} = \bar{0}$ for some morphism $u : U \rightarrow X$. Then we have a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U & \xrightarrow{u} & X \\ \downarrow v & & \downarrow f \\ T & \xrightarrow{p} & Y \end{array}$$

By doing the pullback of f and p we get the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} U & & & & \\ & \searrow u & & & \\ & & Z & \xrightarrow{g} & X \\ & \swarrow w & \downarrow h & & \downarrow f \\ & & T & \xrightarrow{p} & Y \end{array}$$

Since, by hypothesis, $\bar{g} = \bar{0}$, and we have $\bar{u} = \bar{g}\bar{w}$, we conclude $\bar{u} = \bar{0}$.

1) $\Leftrightarrow$ 4) (see Lemma 1) and 2) $\Rightarrow$ 3) are clear. As for 3) $\Rightarrow$ 4), use the canonical construction of left triangles (cf. [5] or [6, Chapter II.1]). $\checkmark$

The following result identifies strong monomorphisms in stable categories.

Proposition 2. *Assume that $\mathcal{T}$ is contravariantly finite in $\mathcal{A}$. The following assertions are equivalent for a morphism $f \in \mathcal{A}(X, Y)$:*

- 1) $\bar{f}$ is a strong monomorphism in the left triangulated category $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$.
- 2) For every (resp. some) $\mathcal{T}$ -precover $p_Y : T_Y \rightarrow Y$ the parallel to p_Y in the pullback of f and p_Y is a $\mathcal{T}$ -precover of X .
- 3) For every (resp. some) $\mathcal{T}$ -precover $p_Y : T_Y \rightarrow Y$, in the cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{g} & X \\ \downarrow h & & \downarrow f \\ T_Y & \xrightarrow{p_Y} & Y \end{array}$$

we have $T \in \mathcal{T}$.

Proof. 2) $\Rightarrow$ 3) is clear and 3) $\Leftrightarrow$ 1) follows from the construction of left triangles in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ [6, Chapter II.1].

3) $\Rightarrow$ 2) Consider the cartesian square of 3) and a morphism $g' : T' \rightarrow X$ with $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. Since p_Y is a $\mathcal{T}$ -precover, there exists a morphism $h' : T' \rightarrow T_Y$ such that $fg' = p_Y h'$. Now, by the universal property of the cartesian square, there exists a morphism $t : T' \rightarrow T$ such that $gt = g'$. $\checkmark$

Remark. 1) Applying the duality principle, we obtain corresponding results, dual to the above, when considering the right triangulated structure in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ defined by a covariantly finite additive full subcategory $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ closed under direct summands. We leave the statements for the reader.

- 2) Under the hypotheses of Proposition 2, if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\overline{f}$ is a strong monomorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$, then $\overline{f} = \overline{g}$, for some morphism $g : X' \rightarrow Y$ such that $\ker(g) \in \mathcal{T}$. Indeed, take $g = \begin{bmatrix} f & p_Y \end{bmatrix} : X \oplus T_Y \rightarrow Y$, where $p_Y : T_Y \rightarrow Y$ is a $\mathcal{T}$ -precover.
- 3) If, in the situation of (2), the subcategory $\mathcal{T}$ consists of injective objects of $\mathcal{A}$, then g can be chosen to be a monomorphism in $\mathcal{A}$. Indeed, according to (2), we can assume from the beginning that $\ker(f) \in \mathcal{T}$. Then the monomorphism $\ker(f) \rightarrow X$ is a section and we can write $f = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & f|_{X'} \end{bmatrix} : \ker(f) \oplus X' \rightarrow Y$, for some complement X' of $\ker(f)$ in X . Now choose $g = f|_{X'}$.

3. WHEN $\mathcal{T}$ IS A SERRE CLASS

Recall that, given an abelian category $\mathcal{A}$, a full subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is called a *Serre class* if, given an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathcal{A}$, the object Y belongs to $\mathcal{T}$ if and only if X and Z belong to $\mathcal{T}$. All throughout this section, we assume that $\mathcal{T}$ is a Serre class in $\mathcal{A}$. The selfdual condition of Serre classes allows to give a dual result of any one that we shall give here.

Recall also that a pair $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ of full subcategories is a *torsion theory* in $\mathcal{A}$ in case $\mathcal{U}^\perp := \{X \in \mathcal{A} \mid \mathcal{A}(U, X) = 0 \text{ for all } U \in \mathcal{U}\} = \mathcal{V}$, $\mathcal{U} = {}^\perp \mathcal{V} := \{X \in \mathcal{A} \mid \mathcal{A}(X, V) = 0 \text{ for all } V \in \mathcal{V}\}$ and the inclusion functor $i : \mathcal{U} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ has a right adjoint. The concept is selfdual since in that case the inclusion functor $j : \mathcal{V} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ has a left adjoint. The following is an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 2. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an abelian category and $\mathcal{U}$ be a full subcategory closed under taking quotients and extensions. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- 1) $\mathcal{U}$ is contravariantly finite in $\mathcal{A}$.
- 2) The inclusion functor $i : \mathcal{U} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ has a right adjoint.
- 3) $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}^\perp)$ is a torsion theory in $\mathcal{A}$.

Proof. 3) $\Rightarrow$ 2) and 2) $\Rightarrow$ 1) are clear. We just need to prove 1) $\Rightarrow$ 3). If $p_X : U_X \rightarrow X$ is a $\mathcal{U}$ -precover of X , then $\text{im}(p_X) =: u(X)$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$ and one easily shows that the inclusion morphism $j_X : u(X) \rightarrow X$ is a $\mathcal{U}$ -cover, whence uniquely determined up to isomorphism. We leave to the reader the easy verification that the assignment $X \mapsto u(X)$ extends to a functor $u : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ which is right adjoint to the inclusion.

Now $\mathcal{U}^\perp = \{F \in \mathcal{A} \mid u(F) = 0\}$ and we just need to prove that $\mathcal{U} = {}^\perp (\mathcal{U}^\perp)$ or, what is enough, that $u(X/u(X)) = 0$ for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$. But this is clear for $u(X/u(X)) = U/u(X)$ for some subobject U of X containing $u(X)$ and fitting in

a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow u(X) \rightarrow U \rightarrow u(X/u(X)) \rightarrow 0$. Since the two outer terms belong to $\mathcal{U}$ we also have $U \in \mathcal{U}$. But then the canonical inclusion $U \hookrightarrow X$ factors through $j_X : u(X) \rightarrow X$, which implies that $U \subseteq u(X)$ and, hence, we get $u(X/u(X)) = 0$ as desired. $\checkmark$

Our next result identifies the monomorphisms and epimorphisms in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$.

Proposition 3. *The following statements hold for a morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathcal{A}$:*

- 1) $\bar{f}$ is a monomorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ if and only if $\ker(f)$ belongs to $\mathcal{T}$. In case $\mathcal{T}$ is contravariantly finite in $\mathcal{A}$, that happens if and only if $\bar{f}$ is a strong monomorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$.
- 1') $\bar{f}$ is an epimorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ if and only if $\operatorname{cok}(f)$ belongs to $\mathcal{T}$. In case $\mathcal{T}$ is covariantly finite in $\mathcal{A}$, that happens if and only if $\bar{f}$ is a strong epimorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$.
- 2) If $X \in \mathcal{T}^\perp$, then $\bar{f}$ is an isomorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ if and only if f is a section in $\mathcal{A}$ with $\operatorname{cok}(f) \in \mathcal{T}$.

Proof. 1') follows from 1) by duality. So we prove assertion 1). If $\bar{f}$ is a monomorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$, then we know that we have a factorization as follows:

$$f^k : \ker(f) \xrightarrow{j} T \xrightarrow{v} X$$

with $T \in \mathcal{T}$ (notice that j is a monomorphism). Since $\mathcal{T}$ is closed for subobjects, we conclude that $\ker(f) \in \mathcal{T}$.

Suppose now that $\ker(f) \in \mathcal{T}$. According to Proposition 1, we need to prove that, for every morphism $h : T \rightarrow Y$ with $T \in \mathcal{T}$, the parallel to h in the pullback of f and h factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$. But here we have even more, for if Z is the upper left corner of that pullback, we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \ker(f) \rightarrow Z \xrightarrow{h} T$. The fact that $\mathcal{T}$ is a Serre class implies that $Z \in \mathcal{T}$. This same argument also proves, with the help of Proposition 2, that if $\mathcal{T}$ is covariantly finite, then $\bar{f}$ is a strong monomorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$. That ends the proof of assertion 1).

We next prove (the 'only if' part of) assertion 2). If $X \in \mathcal{T}^\perp$ and $\bar{f}$ is an isomorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$, then assertions 1) and 1') imply that $\ker(f), \operatorname{cok}(f) \in \mathcal{T}$. But then $\ker(f) \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^\perp$, which implies $\ker(f) = 0$. On the other hand, since $\bar{f}$ is an isomorphism there exists a morphism $g : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $\mathbf{1}_X - gf$ factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$. That is, we have a factorization $\mathbf{1}_X - gf : X \rightarrow T \rightarrow X$. But, since $X \in \mathcal{T}^\perp$, the second morphism of that factorization is zero, so that $\mathbf{1}_X - gf = 0$ and, hence, f is a section in $\mathcal{A}$ with $\operatorname{cok}(f) \in \mathcal{T}$. $\checkmark$

Definition 2. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be any additive category and $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E}$ two full subcategories. We shall say that $\mathcal{C}$ is the *direct sum* of $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{E}$, written $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{E}$, when the following two conditions hold:

- i) Every object of $\mathcal{C}$ decomposes as a direct sum of an object of $\mathcal{D}$ and an object of $\mathcal{E}$.
- ii) $\mathcal{C}(D, E) = 0 = \mathcal{C}(E, D)$, for all objects $D \in \mathcal{D}$ and $E \in \mathcal{E}$

The main result of this section follows now in an easy way:

Corollary 1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an abelian category and $\mathcal{T}$ be a Serre class in $\mathcal{A}$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- 1) $\mathcal{T}$ is contravariantly (resp. covariantly) finite in $\mathcal{A}$ and $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ is balanced.
- 2) $\mathcal{T}$ is functorially finite in $\mathcal{A}$ and $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ is weakly balanced.

3) $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{T} \oplus \mathcal{T}^\perp$.

Proof. Since assertion 2) is selfdual we just consider the contravariantly finite version of assertion 1).

2) $\Rightarrow$ 1) follows from Proposition 3.

3) $\Rightarrow$ 2) It is easy to see that $\mathcal{T}$ is functorially finite in $\mathcal{A}$, that we have an equivalence $\mathcal{A}/\langle \mathcal{T} \rangle \simeq \mathcal{T}^\perp$ of additive categories and that $\mathcal{T}^\perp$ is abelian (and so $\mathcal{A}/\langle \mathcal{T} \rangle$ will be balanced).

1) $\Rightarrow$ 3) We first prove that $\mathcal{A}(F, T) = 0$, for all $F \in \mathcal{T}^\perp$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}$ or, equivalently, that $\mathcal{T}^\perp \subseteq^\perp \mathcal{T}$. Indeed, let $f : F \rightarrow T$ be a morphism. Replacing T by $\text{im}(f)$ if necessary, we can assume that f is an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$ and we need to prove that $T = 0$. For that we consider the monomorphism $f^k : \ker(f) \rightarrow F$. By Proposition 3, we know that $\overline{f^k}$ is both a monomorphism and an epimorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$. Since this is a balanced category, we conclude that $\overline{f^k}$ is an isomorphism. But then Proposition 3 gives that f^k is a section (with cokernel in $\mathcal{T}$). Then f is a retraction, but any section for it must be zero because $T \in \mathcal{T}$ and $F \in \mathcal{T}^\perp$. Therefore $T = 0$ as desired.

On the other hand, since $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}^\perp)$ is a torsion theory (cf. Lemma 2) we can consider, for every object $X \in \mathcal{A}$, the canonical exact sequence $0 \rightarrow t(X) \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{p_X} X/t(X) \rightarrow 0$. According to Proposition 3, we know that $\overline{p_X}$ is both a monomorphism and an epimorphism, whence an isomorphism, in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$. Since $X/t(X) \in \mathcal{T}^\perp \subseteq^\perp \mathcal{T}$ the dual of Proposition 3(2) says that p_X is a retraction in $\mathcal{A}$. Then we have an isomorphism $X \cong t(X) \oplus \frac{X}{t(X)}$ and the proof is finished. $\checkmark$

4. BALANCE WHEN $\mathcal{T}$ CONSISTS OF PROJECTIVE OBJECTS

Throughout the rest of the paper, unless explicitly said otherwise, the full subcategory $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ consists of projective objects. Notice that we do not assume that $\mathcal{A}$ has enough projectives. Dual results of ours can be obtained by assuming instead that $\mathcal{T}$ consists of injective objects. We leave their statement for the reader.

Our next observation is that every epimorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ can be represented by an epimorphism of $\mathcal{A}$, something that was already noticed by Auslander and Bridger in the (classical) projectively stable category of a module category (cf. [2] and, for related questions, see also [11]).

Lemma 3. *Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(X, Y)$ be such that $\overline{f}$ is an epimorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$. Then the canonical monomorphism $\text{im}(f) \rightarrow Y$ yields a retraction in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ and there exists an epimorphism $f' \in \mathcal{A}(X', Y)$ such that $\overline{f'} \cong \overline{f}$ in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Let f^c be the cokernel of f in $\mathcal{A}$. From $f^c f = 0$ and the fact that $\overline{f}$ is an epimorphism we deduce that $\overline{f^c} = \overline{0}$. Therefore, there exists a factorization as follows:

$$f^c : Y \xrightarrow{h} T \xrightarrow{p} \text{cok}(f)$$

with $T \in \mathcal{T}$.

Now, since T is projective there exists a morphism $g : T \rightarrow Y$ such that $f^c g = p$, and so $f^c(gh - \mathbf{1}_Y) = 0$. Hence $gh - \mathbf{1}_Y$ factors through the canonical morphism $\text{im}(f) \rightarrow Y$, which is the kernel of f^c . Then $\text{im}(f) \rightarrow Y$ yields a retraction in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$. This proves the first assertion.

Of course the morphism $f' := \begin{bmatrix} f & g \end{bmatrix} : X \oplus T \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism such that $\overline{f'} = \overline{f}$ in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$. Let us see that f' is an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$. If we have $\varphi f' = 0$, then $\varphi f = 0$ and $\varphi g = 0$. Hence, there exists a morphism u such that $uf^c = \varphi$, which implies $uf^c g = 0$, *i.e.* $up = 0$. Since p is an epimorphism we get $u = 0$ and so $\varphi = 0$. $\checkmark$

Since our first goal is to characterize when $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ is balanced, the above observation suggests to characterize those epimorphisms in $\mathcal{A}$ which become epimorphisms, monomorphisms or isomorphisms when passing to $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$. Our next results go in that direction.

Proposition 4. *Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(X, Y)$ be an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- 1) $\overline{f}$ is an epimorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$.
- 2) For every morphism $h : X \rightarrow T$ with $T \in \mathcal{T}$, there is a morphism $\tilde{h} : X \rightarrow h(\ker(f))$ such that h and $\tilde{h}$ coincide on $\ker(f)$.

When $\mathcal{T}$ is also covariantly finite, the above conditions are also equivalent to:

- 3) For every (resp. some) $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope $\mu^X : X \rightarrow T^X$, there is a morphism $\tilde{\mu} : X \rightarrow \mu^X(\ker(f))$ such that μ^X and $\tilde{\mu}$ coincide on $\ker(f)$.

Proof. 1) $\Rightarrow$ 2) According to the dual of Proposition 1, if $\overline{f}$ is an epimorphism then, for every morphism $h : X \rightarrow T$ to an object $T \in \mathcal{T}$, the parallel to h in the pushout of f and h factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$. We consider that pushout:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \\ h \downarrow & & \downarrow v \\ T & \xrightarrow{u} & Z \end{array}$$

so that we have a factorization $v : Y \xrightarrow{v_1} T' \xrightarrow{v_2} Z$, with $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. Since u is an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$ and T' is projective, we get a morphism $\varphi : T' \rightarrow T$ such that $u\varphi = v_2$. Then one gets $u\varphi v_1 = v$. Hence $u(h - \varphi v_1 f) = uh - vf = 0$. From that we get a morphism $\tilde{h} : X \rightarrow \ker(u)$ such that $h - \varphi v_1 f = u^k \tilde{h}$, where u^k is the kernel of u , and thus it follows easily that h and $\tilde{h}$ coincide on $\ker(f)$. We only have to notice that, since f is an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$, a classical construction of pushouts in abelian categories gives that u is the cokernel map of the composition $\ker(f) \xrightarrow{f^k} X \xrightarrow{h} T$. Then $u^k : \ker(u) \rightarrow T$ gets identified with the canonical inclusion $h(\ker(f)) \hookrightarrow T$.

2) $\Rightarrow$ 1) Let $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ be a morphism in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\overline{gf} = \overline{0}$ in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$. Then we have a factorization $gf : X \xrightarrow{h} T \xrightarrow{p} Z$, where $T \in \mathcal{T}$. The hypothesis says that we have a morphism $\tilde{h} : X \rightarrow h(\ker(f))$ such that $j\tilde{h}f^k = hf^k$, where $j : h(\ker(f)) \rightarrow T$ is the monomorphism of the canonical epi-mono factorization:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \ker(f) & \xrightarrow{hf^k} & T \\ & \searrow q & \nearrow j \\ & h(\ker(f)) & \end{array}$$

Then $(h - j\tilde{h})f^k = 0$, which implies that $h - j\tilde{h}$ factors through the cokernel of f^k , *i.e.* through f . Then we have a morphism $\xi : Y \rightarrow T$ such that $h - j\tilde{h} = \xi f$ and we

get $gf = ph = p(j\tilde{h} + \xi f)$. Since $pjq = phf^k = gff^k = 0$ we get that $pj = 0$ and so $gf = p\xi f$. Being f an epimorphism, we conclude that $g = p\xi$, and hence $\bar{g} = \bar{0}$.

Suppose now that $\mathcal{T}$ is covariantly finite. We only have to prove (the weak version of) 3) $\Rightarrow$ 2). Let us fix a $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope $\mu^X : X \rightarrow T^X$ for which condition 3) holds. If now $h : X \rightarrow T$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{A}$, with $T \in \mathcal{T}$, then there is a factorization $h : X \xrightarrow{\mu^X} T^X \xrightarrow{g} T$. Then g induces a morphism $\tilde{g} : \mu^X(\ker(f)) \rightarrow h(\ker(f))$. The hypothesis says that we have a morphism $\tilde{\mu} : X \rightarrow \mu^X(\ker(f))$ such that μ^X and $\tilde{\mu}$ coincide on $\ker(f)$. Put now $\tilde{h} =: \tilde{g}\tilde{\mu} : X \rightarrow h(\ker(f))$ and one easily checks that h and $\tilde{h}$ coincide on $\ker(f)$. $\checkmark$

Proposition 5. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$. Then $\bar{f}$ is a monomorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ if and only if the canonical monomorphism $f^k : \ker(f) \rightarrow X$ factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. If $\bar{f}$ is a monomorphism then, since $\bar{f}\bar{f}^k = \bar{0}$, we have $\bar{f}^k = \bar{0}$, i.e. f^k factors through $\mathcal{T}$. On the other hand, suppose that the canonical monomorphism $f^k : \ker(f) \rightarrow X$ factors in the form $f^k : \ker(f) \xrightarrow{u} T \xrightarrow{q} X$, where $T \in \mathcal{T}$. According to Proposition 1, it is enough to prove that, for every morphism $p : T' \rightarrow Y$ from an object $T' \in \mathcal{T}$, the parallel to p in the pullback of f and p is a morphism which factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$. We then consider that pullback:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z & \xrightarrow{r} & X \\ g \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ T' & \xrightarrow{p} & Y \end{array}$$

Since f is epi it follows that g is also epi, and we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \ker(f) \rightarrow Z \xrightarrow{g} T' \rightarrow 0$$

in $\mathcal{A}$. Since T' is projective this sequence splits and we can identify $Z = \ker(f) \oplus T'$, $g = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} : \ker(f) \oplus T' \rightarrow T'$ and $r = \begin{bmatrix} f^k & \xi \end{bmatrix} : \ker(f) \oplus T' \rightarrow X$, where $\xi : T' \rightarrow X$ is a morphism such that $f\xi = p$. But then we have the following factorization of r :

$$\ker(f) \oplus T' \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}} T \oplus T' \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} q & \xi \end{bmatrix}} X$$

Therefore r factors through the object $T \oplus T' \in \mathcal{T}$. $\checkmark$

Corollary 2. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- 1) $\bar{f}$ is both a monomorphism and an epimorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$
- 2) The canonical monomorphism $f^k : \ker(f) \rightarrow X$ factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$ and, for every morphism $h : X \rightarrow T$ to an object of $\mathcal{T}$, there is a morphism $\tilde{h} : X \rightarrow h(\ker(f))$ such that h and $\tilde{h}$ coincide on $\ker(f)$.

The following result finishes this series of preliminaries leading to the characterization of when $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ is balanced.

Proposition 6. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- 1) $\bar{f}$ is an isomorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$.

- 2) f is a retraction in $\mathcal{A}$ with $\ker(f) \in \mathcal{T}$
 3) f is a retraction in $\mathcal{A}$ whose kernel map $f^k : \ker(f) \rightarrow X$ factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$.

Proof. 2) $\Rightarrow$ 1) and 2) $\Rightarrow$ 3) are clear.

3) $\Rightarrow$ 2) If 3) holds then $\ker(f)$ is a direct summand of an object of $\mathcal{T}$, and our assumption on $\mathcal{T}$ implies that $\ker(f) \in \mathcal{T}$.

1) $\Rightarrow$ 3) Since $\bar{f}$ is an isomorphism it is also a monomorphism and an epimorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$, so that Corollary 2 applies. Let us choose $g : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $\bar{g} = \bar{f}^{-1}$. Then $\mathbf{1}_X - gf$ factors in the form $X \xrightarrow{h} T' \xrightarrow{v} X$, with $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. Applying Corollary 2, we get a morphism $\tilde{h} : X \rightarrow h(\ker(f))$ such that $j\tilde{h}f^k = hf^k$, where $j : h(\ker(f)) \hookrightarrow T'$ is the canonical inclusion (*i.e.* the monomorphism in the epi-mono factorization of hf^k).

Notice now that the restriction of $vh = \mathbf{1}_X - gf$ to $\ker(f)$ is the identity map, in particular $(vh)(\ker(f)) = \ker(f)$. If we denote by $\hat{v}$ the morphism $h(\ker(f)) \rightarrow (vh)(\ker(f)) = \ker(f)$ induced by v then, by definition, we have $f^k\hat{v} = vj$. But then $f^k\hat{v}hf^k = vj\tilde{h}f^k = vhf^k = (\mathbf{1}_X - gf)f^k = f^k$. Since f^k is a monomorphism we then get that $\hat{v}\tilde{h}f^k$ is the identity on $\ker(f)$. Therefore f^k is a section which, according to Corollary 2, factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$. $\checkmark$

We come now to the main result of this section.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an abelian category and $\mathcal{T}$ be a full subcategory consisting of projective objects which is closed under taking finite direct sums and direct summands. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- 1) $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ is balanced.
- 2) If $\mu : K \rightarrow X$ is a non-split monomorphism which factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$, then there exists a morphism $h : X \rightarrow T'$, with $T' \in \mathcal{T}$, such that no morphism $\tilde{h} : X \rightarrow (h\mu)(K)$ coincides with h on K .
- 3) If $\mu : T \rightarrow X$ is a non-split monomorphism with $T \in \mathcal{T}$, then there exists a morphism $h : X \rightarrow T'$, with $T' \in \mathcal{T}$, such that no morphism $\tilde{h} : X \rightarrow (h\mu)(T)$ coincides with h on T .
- 4) If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is an epimorphism satisfying conditions i) and ii) below, then it is a retraction:
 - i) $f^k : \ker(f) \rightarrow X$ factors through an object of $\mathcal{T}$.
 - ii) For every $h : X \rightarrow T \in \mathcal{T}$ the canonical epimorphism $\ker(f) \twoheadrightarrow h(\ker(f))$ factors through $f^k : \ker(f) \rightarrow X$.
- 5) For every non-split epimorphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ with $\ker(f) \in \mathcal{T}$, there exists a morphism $h : X \rightarrow T'$, with $T' \in \mathcal{T}$, such that $\ker(f) + \ker(h - gf)$ is strictly contained in X for all morphisms $g : Y \rightarrow T'$.

Proof. 4) $\Leftrightarrow$ 2) and 2) $\Rightarrow$ 3) are clear.

1) $\Leftrightarrow$ 4) is a consequence of Corollary 2 and Proposition 6, bearing in mind that every epimorphism of $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ can be represented by an epimorphism of $\mathcal{A}$.

3) $\Rightarrow$ 2) Let $\mu : K \rightarrow X$ be a non-split monomorphism of $\mathcal{A}$ which admits a factorization

$$\mu : K \xrightarrow{u} T \xrightarrow{v} X$$

with $T \in \mathcal{T}$. Consider the following pushout diagram $(*)$ with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & K & \xrightarrow{\mu} & X & \longrightarrow & Y \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow u & & \downarrow u' & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T & \xrightarrow{\mu'} & X' & \longrightarrow & Y \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

We work separately the case in which μ' does not split and the case in which it splits. In the first case, assertion 3) gives a morphism $h' : X' \rightarrow T'$, with $T' \in \mathcal{T}$, such that no morphism $\tilde{h}' : X' \rightarrow h'\mu'(T)$ coincides with h' on T . We claim that $h = h'u'$ satisfies the property needed in assertion 2). Suppose not, so that there exists a morphism $\tilde{h} : X \rightarrow (h\mu)(K) = (h'u'\mu)(K) = (h'\mu'u)(K)$ which coincides with h on K . Since $u(K) \subseteq T$ we get $(h'\mu'u)(K) \subseteq (h'\mu')(T)$ and the composition $X \xrightarrow{\tilde{h}} (h'\mu'u)(K) \hookrightarrow (h'\mu')(T)$ is denoted by α . If $\hat{h}' : T \rightarrow (h'\mu')(T)$ denotes the unique morphism such that the composition $T \xrightarrow{\hat{h}'} (h'u')(T) \hookrightarrow T'$ coincides with $h'\mu'$, then we have the following commutative diagram, which can be completed with $\tilde{h}'$ due to the universal property of pushouts:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{\mu} & X \\ \downarrow u & & \downarrow u' \\ T & \xrightarrow{\mu'} & X' \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \searrow \alpha \\ \searrow \tilde{h}' \\ \searrow \hat{h}' \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ (h'\mu')(T) \end{array}$$

But then $\tilde{h}'$ coincides with h' on T due to the equality $\tilde{h}'\mu' = \hat{h}'$. That contradicts the choice of h' .

Suppose next that μ' splits. Then we rewrite the pushout diagram $(*)$ as:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & K & \xrightarrow{\mu} & X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow u & & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} h \\ f \end{bmatrix} & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}} & T \oplus Y & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}} & Y \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

We claim that h satisfies the property required by assertion 2). Indeed, suppose not, so that there exists $\tilde{h} : X \rightarrow (h\mu)(K) = u(K)$ that coincides with h on K . Since u is a monomorphism the induced morphism $\hat{u} : K \xrightarrow{\cong} u(K)$ is an isomorphism, which, in addition, has the property that $u\hat{u}^{-1}$ is the canonical inclusion $j : u(K) = (h\mu)(K) \hookrightarrow T$. Consider the composition

$$\alpha : X \xrightarrow{\tilde{h}} u(K) \xrightarrow{\hat{u}^{-1}} K.$$

Then $u\alpha\mu = u\hat{u}^{-1}\tilde{h}\mu = j\tilde{h}\mu = h\mu = u$. Since u is a monomorphism we get $\alpha\mu = 1_K$, and so μ split, which is a contradiction.

3) $\Rightarrow$ 5) Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be an epimorphism as indicated and let $\mu : T := \ker(f) \rightarrow X$ be its kernel. Choose a morphism $h : X \rightarrow T'$ as given by assertion 3). Suppose that there is a morphism $g : Y \rightarrow T'$ such that $T + \ker(h - gf) = X$.

Then we have: $\text{im}(h - gf) = (h - gf)(X) = (h - gf)(T) \subseteq h(T) + (gf)(T) = h(T)$. That gives a morphism $\tilde{h} : X \rightarrow h(T)$ such that $i\tilde{h} = h - gf$, where $i : h(T) \rightarrow T'$ is the canonical inclusion. But then $i\tilde{h}\mu = (h - gf)\mu = h\mu$, which contradicts the choice of h .

5) $\Rightarrow$ 3) Let $\mu : T \rightarrow X$ be a non-split monomorphism with $T \in \mathcal{T}$ and let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be its cokernel. We pick up a morphism $h : X \rightarrow T' \in \mathcal{T}$ satisfying the hypothesis of condition 5). We will prove that it also satisfies the requirements of condition 3). Suppose that there is a morphism $\tilde{h} : X \rightarrow \text{im}(h\mu)$ such that in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{\mu} & X \\ p \downarrow & \swarrow \tilde{h} & \downarrow h \\ \text{im}(h\mu) & \xrightarrow{i} & T' \end{array}$$

we have $h\mu = i\tilde{h}\mu$, where $ip = h\mu$ is the canonical epi-mono factorization of $h\mu$. Then $(h - i\tilde{h})\mu = 0$ and so there exists a morphism $g : Y \rightarrow T'$ such that $i\tilde{h} = h - gf$. Thus $\ker(h - gf) = \ker(i\tilde{h}) \cong \ker(\tilde{h})$. We claim that the morphism

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{h}^k & \mu \end{bmatrix} : \ker(\tilde{h}) \oplus T \rightarrow X$$

is an epimorphism and that will imply that $\ker(h - gf) + \ker(f) = X$, thus yielding a contradiction. Indeed, from $\tilde{h}\mu = p$ we get that $\tilde{h}$ is an epimorphism, and so it is the cokernel of its kernel. Now, if a is a morphism such that $a\tilde{h}^k = 0$ and $a\mu = 0$, then there exists a morphism b such that $b\tilde{h} = a$. Hence $0 = b\tilde{h}\mu = bp$, which implies $b = 0$, and therefore $a = 0$. $\checkmark$

Corollary 3. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an abelian category and let $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ be a full subcategory consisting of projective-injective objects, closed under finite direct sums and direct summands. Then $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ is balanced.*

Proof. Condition 3) of Theorem 1 trivially holds. $\checkmark$

5. WEAK BALANCE WHEN $\mathcal{T}$ CONSISTS OF PROJECTIVE OBJECTS

In this section the hypotheses on $\mathcal{T}$ are the same as in section 3, but, in order to have suitable one-sided (pre)triangulated structures on $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$, further assumptions will be made in each particular result. We already know that strong monomorphisms in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$, whenever they make sense, are represented by epimorphisms. In order to characterize the weak balance of $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ in case $\mathcal{T}$ is functorially finite, we will identify first those epimorphisms in $\mathcal{A}$ which become strong epis and strong monos in $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$.

Proposition 7. *Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(X, Y)$ be an epimorphism and suppose that $\mathcal{T}$ is co-variantly finite in $\mathcal{A}$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- 1) $\bar{f}$ is a strong epimorphism in the right triangulated category $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$
- 2) For every (resp. some) $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope $\mu^X : X \rightarrow T^X$, one has that the canonical monomorphism $\mu^X(\ker(f)) \rightarrow T^X$ splits.

3) There is a decomposition $X = T' \oplus X'$, with $T' \in \mathcal{T}$, and

$$f = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & f' \end{bmatrix} : T' \oplus X' \rightarrow Y$$

such that $\mathcal{A}(f', T) : \mathcal{A}(Y, T) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{A}(X', T)$ is an isomorphism for every $T \in \mathcal{T}$.

4) There is a decomposition $X = T' \oplus X'$, with $T' \in \mathcal{T}$, and

$$f = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & f' \end{bmatrix} : T' \oplus X' \rightarrow Y$$

such that every morphism $h : X' \rightarrow T$ to an object of $\mathcal{T}$ vanishes on $\ker(f')$.

Proof. 1) $\Leftrightarrow$ 2) Let $\mu^X : X \rightarrow T^X$ be any $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope. Since f is an epimorphism a canonical construction gives a cocartesian square of the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\mu^X} & T^X \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ Y & \longrightarrow & T^X / \mu^X(\ker(f)) \end{array}$$

where π is the canonical projection. Now, from the dual of Proposition 2, we get that condition 1) holds if and only if $T^X / \mu^X(\ker(f)) \in \mathcal{T}$. Since $\mathcal{T}$ consists of projective objects, the latter is equivalent to 2).

3) $\Leftrightarrow$ 4) Let $f' : X' \rightarrow Y$ be an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$. Clearly, the map $\mathcal{A}(f', T) : \mathcal{A}(Y, T) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(X', T)$ is an isomorphism if and only if every homomorphism $h : X' \rightarrow T$ vanishes on $\ker(f')$. From that the equivalence of assertions 3) and 4) is obvious.

4) $\Rightarrow$ 2) If we have a decomposition $f = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & f' \end{bmatrix} : X = T' \oplus X' \rightarrow Y$ as given by condition 4), then f' is necessarily an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$. Let now $\mu^X = \begin{pmatrix} u & v \end{pmatrix} : T' \oplus X' \rightarrow T^X$ be any $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope. One readily sees that u is a section, so that μ^X can be written as a matrix $\mu^X = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \varphi \\ 0 & \psi \end{bmatrix} : T' \oplus X' \rightarrow T' \oplus T'' = T^X$. One then checks that $\psi : X' \rightarrow T''$ is a $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope and, in particular, we have $\varphi = \rho\psi$, for some morphism $\rho : T'' \rightarrow T'$. Now we have $\mu^X(\ker(f)) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho\psi \\ 0 & \psi \end{bmatrix} (T' \oplus \ker(f'))$. By hypothesis, $\psi(\ker(f')) = 0$, from which it follows that $\mu^X(\ker(f)) = T' \oplus 0$ is a direct summand of T^X .

2) $\Rightarrow$ 4) Let us fix a $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope $\mu^X : X \rightarrow T^X$ satisfying condition 2). Then the composition of inclusions $\mu^X(\ker(f)) \hookrightarrow \text{im}(\mu^X) \hookrightarrow T^X$ is a section in $\mathcal{T}$, which implies that $T' =: \mu^X(\ker(f))$ is also a direct summand of $\text{im}(\mu^X)$, so that we have a decomposition $\text{im}(\mu^X) = T' \oplus V$. Looking now at the induced epimorphisms $\tilde{\mu} : X \twoheadrightarrow \text{im}(\mu^X) = T' \oplus V$ and $\ker(f) \twoheadrightarrow \mu^X(\ker(f)) = T'$, and bearing in mind that T' is a projective object, we can assume without loss of generality that there are decompositions $X = T' \oplus X'$ and $f = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & f' \end{bmatrix} : T' \oplus X' \rightarrow Y$ (i.e. $T' \subseteq \ker(f)$). Then μ^X gets identified with $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu^{X'} \end{bmatrix} : T' \oplus X' \rightarrow T' \oplus T^{X'} = T^X$, where $\mu^{X'} : X' \rightarrow T^{X'}$ is a $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope such that $\mu^{X'}(\ker(f')) = 0$. Since every morphism $h : X' \rightarrow T$, with $T \in \mathcal{T}$, factors through $\mu^{X'}$ assertion 4) follows. $\checkmark$

Proposition 8. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}(X, Y)$ be an epimorphism and suppose that $\mathcal{T}$ is contravariantly finite in $\mathcal{A}$. In the left triangulated category $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$, the morphism $\overline{f}$ is a strong monomorphism if and only if $\ker(f) \in \mathcal{T}$.

Proof. If $p_Y : T_Y \rightarrow Y$ is any $\mathcal{T}$ -precover, then the pullback of f and p_Y

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z & \xrightarrow{g} & T_Y \\ r \downarrow & & \downarrow p_Y \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \end{array}$$

gives rise to a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \ker(f) \rightarrow Z \xrightarrow{g} T_Y \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathcal{A}$, which splits due to the fact that T_Y is projective. Then $\ker(f)$ belongs to $\mathcal{T}$ if and only if Z belongs to $\mathcal{T}$. Then the result follows from Proposition 2. $\checkmark$

Corollary 4. *Suppose that $\mathcal{T}$ is functorially finite in $\mathcal{A}$ and let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- 1) $\bar{f}$ is a strong monomorphism and a strong epimorphism in the pretriangulated category $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$.
- 2) $\ker(f) \in \mathcal{T}$ and, for some $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope $\mu^X : X \rightarrow T^X$, one has that $\mu^X(\ker(f))$ is a direct summand of T^X .
- 3) $\ker(f) \in \mathcal{T}$ and there is a decomposition $f = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & f' \end{bmatrix} : X = T' \oplus X' \rightarrow Y$ such that every morphism $h : X' \rightarrow T$ to an object of $\mathcal{T}$ vanishes on $\ker(f')$

Proof. Direct consequence of Propositions 7 and 8. $\checkmark$

All these preliminaries lead to the following main result of this section.

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an abelian category and $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ be a functorially finite full subcategory consisting of projective objects and which is closed under taking direct summands. Consider the following assertions:*

- 1) For every object $T \in \mathcal{T}$, there is a monomorphism $T \rightarrow E$, where E is an injective(-projective) object of $\mathcal{A}$ which belongs to $\mathcal{T}$.
- 2) For every $T \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{0\}$, there is a nonzero morphism $\varphi : T \rightarrow T'$, with $T' \in \mathcal{T}$, which factors through an injective object of $\mathcal{A}$.
- 3) The pretriangulated category $\underline{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A} / \langle \mathcal{T} \rangle$ is weakly balanced.
- 4) If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\ker(f) \in \mathcal{T}$ and every morphism $h : X \rightarrow T \in \mathcal{T}$ vanishes on $\ker(f)$, then f is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{A}$.
- 5) If $0 \neq T \xrightarrow{j} X$ is a monomorphism in $\mathcal{A}$, with $T \in \mathcal{T}$, then there is a morphism $h : X \rightarrow T'$ such that $hj \neq 0$, for some $T' \in \mathcal{T}$.
- 6) If Y is an object of $\mathcal{A}$ such that the covariant functor

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(Y, ?)|_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \text{Mod } \mathbf{Z}$$

is nonzero, then $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(Y, ?)|_{\mathcal{T}}$ does not contain a nonzero representable subfunctor.

Then $1) \Rightarrow 2) \Rightarrow 3) \Leftrightarrow 4) \Leftrightarrow 5) \Leftrightarrow (6)$ and, in case $\mathcal{A}$ has enough injectives, all assertions 2) – 6) are equivalent.

Proof. $1) \Rightarrow 2)$ is clear.

$2) \Rightarrow 4)$ Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$ satisfying the hypothesis of (4). Suppose that f is not an isomorphism. Then $\ker(f) \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{0\}$, and by (2) there exists a non-zero morphism $\varphi : \ker(f) \rightarrow T'$, for some $T' \in \mathcal{T}$, which factors through an injective object of $\mathcal{A}$. Then φ extends to X and this contradicts the hypothesis of (4).

3) $\Leftrightarrow$ 4) is a direct consequence of Corollary 4 and Proposition 6, bearing in mind that strong epimorphisms of $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ can be represented by epimorphisms of $\mathcal{A}$.

4) $\Leftrightarrow$ 5) is clear.

4) $\Rightarrow$ 6) Let $Y \in \mathcal{A}$ be an object such that $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(Y, ?)|_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \text{Mod } \mathbf{Z}$ is a nonzero functor. Suppose that we have a monomorphism of functors $\mu : \mathcal{T}(T, ?) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(Y, ?)|_{\mathcal{T}}$. We choose the element $\tilde{\mu} \in \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(Y, T)$ corresponding to μ by Yoneda's lemma. Then $\tilde{\mu}$ represents a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow T \xrightarrow{j} X \xrightarrow{f} Y \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathcal{A}$. Then f is an epimorphism in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\ker(f) \in \mathcal{T}$. On the other hand, if $h : X \rightarrow T'$ is a morphism to an object of $\mathcal{T}$, then $\mu_{T'} : \mathcal{T}(T, T') \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(Y, T')$ maps hj onto the (exact) lower row of the following pushout diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & T & \xrightarrow{j} & X & \longrightarrow & Y \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow hj & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T' & \longrightarrow & X' & \longrightarrow & Y \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

That lower row splits because hj factors through j . Therefore $\mu_{T'}(hj) = 0$. The monomorphic condition of μ implies that $hj = 0$. Thus, every morphism $h : X \rightarrow T'$, with $T' \in \mathcal{T}$, vanishes on $T = \ker(f)$. Now assertion (4) says that f is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{A}$ and, hence, that $T = 0$.

6) $\Rightarrow$ 4) Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be an epimorphism as indicated in assertion 4) and consider the associated short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow T \xrightarrow{j} X \xrightarrow{f} Y \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathcal{A}$. By Yoneda's lemma, we get an induced morphism of functors $\mu : \mathcal{T}(T, ?) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(Y, ?)|_{\mathcal{T}}$ (functors $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \text{Mod } \mathbf{Z}$). We claim that μ is a monomorphism and then the hypothesis will give $\mathcal{T}(T, ?) = 0$, whence $T = 0$, which will end the proof of this implication. Let us prove our claim. If $T' \in \mathcal{T}$ is any object then $\mu_{T'} : \mathcal{T}(T, T') \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(Y, T')$ maps a morphism $\varphi : T \rightarrow T'$ onto the (exact) lower row of the following pushout diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & T & \xrightarrow{j} & X & \longrightarrow & Y \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \varphi & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T' & \longrightarrow & X' & \longrightarrow & Y \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

One has that $\mu_{T'}(\varphi) = 0$ if and only if that lower row splits. But this is equivalent to say that φ is the restriction to $T = \ker(f)$ of a morphism $h : X \rightarrow T'$. In that case, the hypothesis on f says that $\varphi = 0$. Therefore μ is a monomorphism of functors as desired.

We finally prove 5) $\Rightarrow$ 2) in case $\mathcal{A}$ has enough injectives. Let us take $0 \neq T \in \mathcal{T}$. There is a monomorphism $j : T \rightarrow E$, with E injective. Now assertion 5) says that there exists a morphism $h : E \rightarrow T'$, with $T' \in \mathcal{T}$, such that $\varphi = hj \neq 0$. That ends the proof. $\checkmark$

We shall end the section by characterizing (weak) balance in abelian categories on which subobjects of projective objects are projective. We denote by $\text{Sub}(\mathcal{T})$ the full subcategory having as objects those which are subobjects of objects in $\mathcal{T}$. The following is an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an abelian category in which subobjects of projective objects are projective and let $\mathcal{T}$ be a full subcategory of $\mathcal{H}$ consisting of projective objects and closed under direct summands. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathcal{T}$ is covariantly finite in $\mathcal{H}$
- (2) $\text{Sub}(\mathcal{T})$ is covariantly finite in $\mathcal{H}$ and every $P \in \text{Sub}(\mathcal{T})$ has a $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope
- (3) $({}^\perp\mathcal{T}, \text{Sub}(\mathcal{T}))$ is a (split) torsion theory in $\mathcal{H}$ and every $P \in \text{Sub}(\mathcal{T})$ has a $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope

Proof. 1) $\implies$ 2) If $\mu^X : X \rightarrow T^X$ is a $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope and we take its epi-mono factorization $X \xrightarrow{p} P \xrightarrow{j} X$, then p is a $\text{Sub}(\mathcal{T})$ -preenvelope.

2) $\implies$ 1) If $\lambda : X \rightarrow P$ and $\mu : P \rightarrow T^P$ are a $\text{Sub}(\mathcal{T})$ -preenvelope and a $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope, respectively, then $\mu\lambda$ is a $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope.

2) $\Leftrightarrow$ 3) is a direct consequence of the dual of Lemma 2 $\checkmark$

Recall that a torsion theory $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is called *hereditary* when $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under taking subobjects.

Proposition 9. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an abelian category in which subobjects of projective objects are projective, and let $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ be a covariantly finite full subcategory of $\mathcal{H}$ consisting of projective objects and closed under taking direct summands. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- 1) $\underline{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H} / < \mathcal{T} >$ is balanced.
- 2) ${}^\perp\mathcal{T}$ is closed under taking subobjects.
- 3) The pair $({}^\perp\mathcal{T}, \text{Sub}(\mathcal{T}))$ is a hereditary (split) torsion theory in $\mathcal{H}$.

When $\mathcal{T}$ is contravariantly finite in $\mathcal{H}$, the above assertions are equivalent to:

- 4) $\underline{\mathcal{H}}$ is weakly balanced

When $\mathcal{H}$ has enough injectives, assertions 1), 2) and 3) are also equivalent to:

- 5) For every object $T \in \mathcal{T}$, there is a monomorphism $T \hookrightarrow E$, where E is an injective(-projective) object of $\mathcal{H}$ which belongs to $\mathcal{T}$.

Proof. We start by proving that, under anyone of conditions 1), 3) or 4), if

$$\lambda := \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix} : T \rightarrow Y \oplus P$$

is a monomorphism, where $T \in \mathcal{T}$, $Y \in {}^\perp\mathcal{T}$ and P is projective, then v is also a monomorphism. Indeed, since subobjects of projective objects are projective we get that $T_2 := \text{im}(v)$ is projective and the induced epimorphism $\tilde{v} : T \rightarrow T_2$ splits. Then we can decompose $T \cong T_1 \oplus T_2$, where $T_1 := \ker(v)$, and then rewrite λ as $\begin{bmatrix} u_1 & u_2 \\ 0 & v_2 \end{bmatrix}$. Since λ is a monomorphism it follows easily that u_1 is a monomorphism. Under conditions 1) or 3), using condition 3) of Theorem 1 or condition 5) of Theorem 2, one readily sees that necessarily $T_1 = 0$. Under condition 2), one has that $T_1 \in \mathcal{T} \cap {}^\perp\mathcal{T}$ since the torsion theory $({}^\perp\mathcal{T}, \text{Sub}(\mathcal{T}))$ is hereditary. But then $T_1 = 0$ as well.

1) $\implies$ 2) By Lemma 4, we know that $({}^\perp\mathcal{T}, \text{Sub}(\mathcal{T}))$ is a split torsion theory in $\mathcal{H}$. Let $i : X \rightarrow Y$ be a monomorphism, where $Y \in {}^\perp\mathcal{T}$, and take any morphism $h : X \rightarrow T$, with $T \in \mathcal{T}$. We then take the bicartesian square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{i} & Y \\ h \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta \\ T & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & V \end{array}$$

Then λ is a monomorphism. We decompose $V = V' \oplus P$, where $V' \in {}^\perp \mathcal{T}$ and $P \in \text{Sub}(\mathcal{T})$. According to the first paragraph of this proof, we can rewrite $\lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma \\ j \end{bmatrix} : T \rightarrow V' \oplus P$, where $j : T \rightarrow P$ is a monomorphism. On the other hand, since $({}^\perp \mathcal{T}, \text{Sub}(\mathcal{T}))$ is a torsion theory, we have $\mathcal{A}(Y, P) = 0$. Then $\eta = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$. The commutativity of the square implies that $jh = 0$ and, since j is a monomorphism, we conclude that $h = 0$. Therefore $X \in {}^\perp \mathcal{T}$.

2) $\Rightarrow$ 3) is a direct consequence of Lemma 4.

3) $\Rightarrow$ 1) We shall check assertion 3) of Theorem 1. Let $\mu : T \rightarrow X$ be a non-split monomorphism in $\mathcal{H}$ with $0 \neq T \in \mathcal{T}$. By hypothesis, we can decompose $X = X' \oplus P$, where $X' \in {}^\perp \mathcal{T}$ and $P \in \text{Sub}(\mathcal{T})$. Then the first paragraph of this proof says that we have $\mu = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix}$, where $v : T \rightarrow P$ is a monomorphism. But, since $P \in \text{Sub}(\mathcal{T})$, we have a monomorphism $w : P \rightarrow T'$, with $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. Clearly $wv \neq 0$ (it is actually a monomorphism). We then claim that $h := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & w \end{bmatrix} : X' \oplus P = X \rightarrow T'$ is a morphism such that no morphism $\tilde{h} : X = X' \oplus P \rightarrow (h\mu)(T) = wv(T)$ coincides with h on T . To see that notice that, if it exists, such a $\tilde{h}$ can be written as $\tilde{h} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \beta \end{pmatrix} : X' \oplus P \rightarrow wv(T)$, because $X' \in {}^\perp \mathcal{T}$ and $wv(T) \cong T' \in \mathcal{T}$. If we denote by i the canonical inclusion $wv(T) \hookrightarrow T'$ and by $\xi : T \xrightarrow{\cong} wv(T) = h\mu(T)$ the isomorphism induced by $h\mu$ (or wv), then we have $i\xi = h\mu = \tilde{h}\mu = i \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix} = i\beta v$. Since i is a monomorphism we conclude that $\xi = \beta v$, so that v is a section. But then $\mu = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix}$ is also a section, which contradicts the hypothesis. Therefore $\tilde{h}$ cannot exist and the proof of this implication is finished.

Suppose now that $\mathcal{T}$ is contravariantly finite in $\mathcal{H}$. Then 1) $\Rightarrow$ 4) clearly holds. The proof of 4) $\Rightarrow$ 2) is identical to that of 1) $\Rightarrow$ 2), done above.

Finally, suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ has enough injectives.

5) $\Rightarrow$ 1) We check condition 3) of Theorem 1. Let $\mu : T \rightarrow X$ be a non-split monomorphism. By hypothesis, there is another monomorphism $j : T \rightarrow E$, where E is an injective object of $\mathcal{H}$ belonging to $\mathcal{T}$. For simplicity, we view j as an inclusion. Now j factors through μ , so that we get a morphism $h : X \rightarrow E$ such that $h\mu = j$. If there were a morphism $\tilde{h} : X \rightarrow h\mu(T) = j(T) = T$ agreeing with h on T , then $\tilde{h}$ would be a retraction for μ , which is absurd.

3) $\Rightarrow$ 5) Let $0 \neq T \in \mathcal{T}$ be any nonzero object. We then have a monomorphism $\lambda : T \rightarrow E$, where E is an injective object of $\mathcal{A}$. We decompose $E = E' \oplus P$, with $E' \in {}^\perp \mathcal{T}$ and $P \in \text{Sub}(\mathcal{T})$. Notice that then P is injective(-projective) and necessarily belongs to $\mathcal{T}$. If we write now $\lambda = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix} : T \rightarrow E' \oplus P$, then the first paragraph of this proof says that v is a monomorphism. That ends the proof. $\checkmark$

Remark. On an arbitrary abelian category $\mathcal{A}$, Yoneda defined the big abelian group $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^n(X, Y)$ of n -extensions (see [14, III.5]), for all objects $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$, which was functorial on both variables. Due to Verdier [24, Ch. III, 3.2.12], $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^n(-, -) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{DA}}(X, Y[n])$, where $\mathcal{DA}$ is the (possibly large) derived category of $\mathcal{A}$. As a consequence, the long exact sequences of Ext hold in every abelian category. In particular, if $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{H}$ is hereditary (i.e. $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(-, -) = 0$), then every subobject of a projective object in $\mathcal{H}$ is projective. Thus our Proposition 9 applies to hereditary abelian categories.

6. SOME EXAMPLES

In this section we illustrate the previous results with some examples in module categories. Unless said otherwise, all rings are associative with unit and modules are left modules. For a given ring R , we denote by $R\mathbf{Mod}$ (resp. $R\mathbf{mod}$) the category of all (resp. finitely presented) left R -modules.

Example 1. Let R be a left semihereditary right coherent ring. Let $\mathcal{T} = R\mathbf{proj}$ the full subcategory of the abelian category $\mathcal{H} = R\mathbf{mod}$ consisting of finitely generated projective modules. By [9, Corollary 3.11], we know that $\mathcal{T}$ is covariantly finite in $\mathcal{H}$. On the other hand, the left semihereditary condition of R gives that in $\mathcal{H}$ subobjects of projective objects are projective, so that we are in the situation of Proposition 9. Then $R\mathbf{mod} = R\mathbf{mod}/R\mathbf{proj}$ is (weakly) balanced if and only if the class ${}^\perp\mathcal{T} = \{M \in R\mathbf{mod} \mid M^* = \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, R) = 0\}$ is closed under (finitely generated) submodules.

Two particular cases of this situation are those in which R is a commutative principal ideal domain or $R = k\vec{A}_n$ is the path algebra of the Dynkin quiver $\vec{A}_n : 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow n-1 \rightarrow n$ over an algebraically closed field k .

It is well-known that the above path algebra $k\vec{A}_n$ is isomorphic to $T_n(k)$, where, for a ring R and a natural number n , $T_n(R)$ denotes the ring of (upper) triangular $n \times n$ matrices with coefficients in R . When one moves from finitely presented to arbitrary modules, only this example survives.

Example 2. Let H be a left hereditary ring. The following assertions are equivalent:

- (1) $H\mathbf{Proj}$ is covariantly finite in $H\mathbf{Mod}$ and $H\mathbf{Mod} = H\mathbf{Mod}/H\mathbf{Proj}$ is a (weakly) balanced category.
- (2) H is Morita equivalent to a finite direct product $T_{n_1}(D_1) \times \dots \times T_{n_r}(D_r)$, for some division rings D_i and natural numbers n_i

Proof. 1) $\Rightarrow$ 2) Since $H\mathbf{Proj}$ is covariantly finite in $H\mathbf{Mod}$ it is closed under taking products, so that H is semiprimary (cf. [7] and [22]). On the other hand, since assertion 4) of Proposition 9 holds, we get that $E({}_H H)$ is projective, so that H is left QF-3 in the sense of Ringel and Tachikawa (see [23, Proposition 4.1]). Then, by [8, Theorem and Remark 1], one concludes that H is Morita equivalent to the indicated direct product of matrix rings.

2) $\Rightarrow$ 1) There is no loss of generality in assuming that $H = T_n(D)$, for some natural number n and some division ring D . Since H is (two-sided) Artinian, the class $H\mathbf{Proj}$ is covariantly finite in $H\mathbf{Mod}$ (see [16, Corollary 3.5]). On the

other hand, H is a serial ring and the column module $E = \begin{bmatrix} D \\ D \\ \vdots \\ D \end{bmatrix} = D^n$ is the

unique injective-projective indecomposable left H -module, which cogenerates all other projective left H -modules. Then assertion 5) of Proposition 9 holds, so that $H\mathbf{Mod}$ is balanced. $\checkmark$

In the situation of Proposition 9, whenever $\mathcal{T}$ is closed for subobjects, one has an equivalence of categories $\underline{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{\mathcal{H}}{\langle \mathcal{T} \rangle} \cong {}^\perp \mathcal{T}$, so that $\underline{\mathcal{H}}$ is an abelian category. That is no longer true if $\mathcal{T}$ is not closed for subobjects, as the following example shows.

Example 3. Let $H = k\vec{A}_3$, where $\vec{A}_3$ is the Dynkin quiver $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3$ and k is an algebraically closed field. Let e_i be the primitive idempotent of H given by the vertex i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) and take $\mathcal{H} = H \text{ mod}$ and $\mathcal{T} = \text{add}(He_3)$. Then $\underline{\mathcal{H}} = H \text{ mod} / \langle \mathcal{T} \rangle$ is a balanced category which is neither abelian nor triangulated (for its usual pretriangulated structure).

Proof. Due to Corollary 3, $\underline{\mathcal{H}}$ is balanced. If $f : He_2 \rightarrow S_2 = \frac{He_2}{J(H)e_2}$ is the canonical projection, then, by Proposition 4, we have that $\bar{f}$ is not an epimorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{H}}$. If this latter category were abelian, we would have a morphism $g : S_2 \rightarrow X$ in $\mathcal{H}$ such that $0 \neq \bar{g} = \bar{f}^c$. But every such morphism g necessarily factors through the (unique up to multiplication by scalar) irreducible morphism starting at S_2 , which is the injective envelope map $j : S_2 \hookrightarrow E(S_2) = \frac{He_3}{\text{Soc}(He_3)}$. Since jf factors through He_3 , we have $\bar{j}\bar{f} = 0$ and from that one derives that, in case of existence of $\bar{f}^c$, one necessarily has $\bar{f}^c = \bar{j}$. But this is absurd for $\bar{j}$ is not an epimorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{H}}$: if $p : E(S_2) = \frac{He_3}{\text{Soc}(He_3)} \rightarrow \frac{He_3}{J(H)e_3} = S_3$ is the canonical projection, then $pj = 0$ but $\bar{p} \neq 0$.

Notice also that $\mathcal{T}^\perp \neq 0$ (e.g. $He_1 \in \mathcal{T}^\perp$), so that the loop functor Ω , given by the pretriangulated structure of $\underline{\mathcal{H}}$, vanishes on some nonzero objects. Therefore $\underline{\mathcal{H}}$ is not a triangulated category either. $\checkmark$

Corollary 1 and Proposition 9 might induce the reader to believe that ‘weak balance’ (when it makes sense) and ‘balance’ are synonymous concepts for stable categories. Our final example shows that it is not the case, even when $\mathcal{T}$ consists of projective objects.

Example 4. Let k be an algebraically closed field and A be the (finite dimensional) k -algebra given by the quiver

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 1 & \xleftarrow{\alpha} & 2 & \xrightarrow{x} & 5 & \xrightarrow{y} & 6 \\ \delta \downarrow & & \uparrow \beta & & & & \\ 4 & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & 3 & & & & \end{array}$$

with the following set of monomial relations $\rho = \{xy, \beta x, \gamma \beta, \alpha \delta \gamma, \beta \alpha \delta\}$. Then $A \text{ proj}$ is functorially finite in $A \text{ mod}$. We claim that $\underline{A \text{ mod}} = A \text{ mod} / A \text{ proj}$ is weakly balanced but not balanced. To see that, first notice that assertion 2) of Theorem 2 is equivalent in this case to the property that, for every indecomposable projective left A -module P , the canonical restriction map $\text{Hom}_A(E(P), A) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(P, A)$ has a nonzero image. This property is trivially satisfied whenever $E(P)$ is projective. In our situation, that is the case for $P = Ae_i$, with $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 6\}$. On the other hand, we have $E(Ae_4) \cong E(Ae_5) \cong \frac{Ae_4 \oplus Ae_5}{N} =: E$, where N is the cyclic submodule of $Ae_4 \oplus Ae_5$ generated by $(-\alpha \delta, x)$. One readily sees that $\text{Hom}_A(E, A)$ is a 2-dimensional vector space generated by the morphisms $f : \overline{(a, b)} \mapsto a\gamma$ and $g : \overline{(a, b)} \mapsto by$. If now $i : Ae_4 \hookrightarrow E$ ($a \mapsto \overline{(a, 0)}$) and $j : Ae_5 \hookrightarrow E$ ($b \mapsto \overline{(0, b)}$) are the canonical inclusions, then clearly $fi \neq 0$ and $gj \neq 0$. That proves that $\underline{A \text{ mod}}$ is weakly balanced.

We shall see now that condition 3) of Theorem 1 is not satisfied by the canonical inclusion $\mu = i : Ae_4 \hookrightarrow E$. Indeed, by the above paragraph, any morphism $h = E \rightarrow_A A$ is of the form $h = k_1 g + k_2 h$, for some $k_1, k_2 \in k$. Then it maps

$\overline{(a, b)} \mapsto k_1 a \gamma + k_2 b \gamma$ and, hence, $(h\mu)(a) = k_1 a \gamma$. In case $k_1 = 0$, clearly h does not satisfy condition 3) of Theorem 1. But if $k_1 \neq 0$ then $\text{im}(h\mu) = \text{im}(f)$ and, choosing $\tilde{h} = k_1 f : E \rightarrow \text{im}(f)$, $\overline{(a, b)} \mapsto k_1 a \gamma$, one clearly has that $\tilde{h}$ coincides with h on Ae_4 . That proves that $\underline{\text{Amod}}$ is not balanced.

REFERENCES

- [1] F.W. Anderson, K.R. Fuller, *Rings and categories of modules*. Springer-Verlag (1992), 2nd edition.
- [2] M. Auslander, M. Bridger, *The stable module theory*. Memoirs AMS **94** (1969).
- [3] M. Auslander, I. Reiten, *Stable equivalence of dualizing R-varieties*. Adv. Math. **12** (1974), 306-366.
- [4] M. Auslander, I. Reiten, S. O. Smalø, *Representation Theory of Artin algebras*. Cambridge St. Adv. Maths. **36**, Cambridge Univ. Press (1995).
- [5] A. Beligianis, N. Marmaridis, *Left triangulated categories arising from contravariantly finite subcategories*, Comm. Algebra **22** (1994), no. 12, 5021-5036.
- [6] A. Beligianis, I. Reiten, *Homological aspects of torsion theories*. To appear in Memoirs AMS. NTNU Trondheim Preprint 3/2001.
- [7] S. U. Chase *Direct products of modules*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **97** (1960), 457-473.
- [8] R. R. Colby, E. A. Rutter *Semiperfect QF-3 and PP rings*, Osaka J. Math **5** (1968) 99-102.
- [9] N. Ding, J. Chen *Relative coherence and preenvelopes*. Manuscr. Math. **81** (1993), 243-262.
- [10] D. Happel *Triangulated categories in the Representation Theory of finite dimensional algebras*. London Math. Soc. LNS **119**. Cambridge Univ. Press (1988).
- [11] K. Kato, *Morphisms represented by monomorphisms*. Proceedings of the 37th Symposium on Ring Theory and Representation Theory 31-42. Osaka (2005).
- [12] B. Keller, D. Vossieck, *Sous les catégories dérivées*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **305** (1987), 225-228.
- [13] B. Keller, *Derived categories and their uses*, Chapter of the Handbook of Algebra, Vol. 1, edited by M. Hazewinkel, Elsevier 1996.
- [14] S. Mac Lane *Homology*. Springer-Verlag (1975), 3rd edition.
- [15] B. Pareigis, *Categories and functors*. Academic Press (1973), 2nd edition.
- [16] J. Rada, M. Saorín, *Rings characterized by (pre)envelopes and (pre)covers of their modules*. Comm. Algebra **26** (1998), 899-912.
- [17] J. Rada, M. Saorín, A. del Valle, *Reflective subcategories*. Glasgow. Math. J. **42** (2000), 97-113.
- [18] J. Rickard, *The abelian defect group conjecture: some recent progress*, in 'Algebras and Representation Theory', by W. Roggenkamp and M. Stefanescu (eds.). Kluwer (2001), 273-299.
- [19] C. M. Ringel, *Tame algebras and integral quadratic forms* Springer LNM **1099** (1984).
- [20] J. J. Rotman, *An introduction to homological algebra*. Academic Press (1979).
- [21] R. Rouquier, *Block theory via stable and Rickard equivalences*, in 'Modular representation theory of finite groups', de Gruyter (2001), 101-146.
- [22] L. Small *Semihereditary rings* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **73** (1967), 656-658.
- [23] H. Tachikawa (and notes by C.M. Ringel) *Quasi-Frobenius rings and generalizations*, Springer LNM **351**.
- [24] J. L. Verdier, *Des catégories dérivées des catégories abéliennes* (Ph. Dissertation). Astérisque **239** (1996).

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS UNIVERSIDAD DE MURCIA, APTDO. 4021, 30100 ESPINARDO, MURCIA, SPAIN

E-mail address: pedronz@um.es

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS UNIVERSIDAD DE MURCIA, APTDO. 4021, 30100 ESPINARDO, MURCIA, SPAIN

E-mail address: msaorinc@um.es